

# FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN

*An interpretation of current international events  
by the Research Staff of the Foreign Policy Association*



Univ. of the South  
The Library  
Sewanee, Tenn.

LS-1

Univ. of the South  
The Library

1918-1948

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION • INCORPORATED • 22 EAST 38TH STREET • NEW YORK 16, N. Y.

VOL. XXVII NO. 43

SEPTEMBER 17, 1948

## Washington Keeps Cool Despite Berlin Disorders

WASHINGTON—The air lift, by which the United States and Britain have been supplying the basic material needs of the western zones of Berlin, no longer touches the heart of the problem which Russia's policy with respect to the city raises for the Western powers. The opening of the new large runway at Tempelhof Luftbahn on September 12 and the arrival of 714 American and British planes in Berlin on September 10 (one every minute) demonstrate Anglo-American success in flying over the Soviet blockade of Berlin. But since a group of Germans representing the Communist-controlled Socialist Unity party forced its way into the City Hall and usurped the functions of the elected and duly constituted City Assembly of Berlin on September 3, the contest to determine whether Berlin is to be controlled by one power or four has come to turn on political and not economic strength. No matter how many planes and tons of goods reach Tempelhof, continuance of the present situation in Berlin may deprive the Western powers, and Berliners loyal to them, of effective influence in the German capital.

### Meaning of Soviet Conduct

In response to the many harassments Communists and German police under Soviet control have inflicted on Western agents and non-Communist local government officials in Berlin during the past ten days, the Washington administration has reaffirmed its determination to maintain its representatives in Berlin in accordance with the international agreements of 1945. President Truman discussed the Berlin

problem with military and civilian members of the National Security Council on September 7, but there is no official indication that the United States wants to settle the controversy by war. The Administration is still looking for a peaceful solution, and it should be noted that the Bureau of the Budget made public a memorandum from Mr. Truman on September 10 to Secretary of National Defense Forrestal, fixing \$15 billion as the maximum military expenditure for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. This is a large sum, but it scarcely exceeds the budget for the current year, and is not sufficient either for war or full-scale preparation for war.

One reason the Administration proceeds with caution is that it is not certain as to the goal the Soviet Union may be seeking to gain by its Berlin policy. Is Russia trying to provoke the West into starting a war? Or is it merely seeking to consolidate its influence in a strategic area regarded by Moscow as essential to its security? Are the disturbances intended to break up the series of conferences between Premier Stalin and Foreign Minister Molotov, on the one hand, and the Western ambassadors, on the other, which have been proceeding in Moscow since July, and have been concerned not only with Berlin but with all outstanding differences between Russia and the West in Germany? Does Russia, by the Berlin disturbances, hope to improve its hand in the negotiations? Or is it using them to indicate its displeasure with the Bonn assembly now considering the establishment of a Western German state from which

Soviet influence is excluded? Russia, in turn, might ask whether the United States is pressing the Berlin issue in order to concentrate Soviet attention on the capital and distract it from Western Germany while the new state is being created. To none of these questions is there a concrete answer today.

By words and actions American officials have indicated their belief that the four powers can resolve the controversy over Berlin in spite of disorders. When the military governors for the United States, Britain, and France met with the Russian military governor, Marshal Vasily Sokolovsky, on September 7, they did not protest against the Communist-led riots in the City Hall on September 5. Instead they discussed questions related to the decision to introduce Soviet currency as the single money in Berlin—a decision reached at Moscow in August. The military governors came to no conclusions, but Western representatives apparently proceed on the hope that the Soviet officials are willing to negotiate about Berlin while German Communists attempt to dominate the city. As the price for the introduction of Soviet currency in all Berlin the West asks for the lifting of the Soviet blockade. The blockade was instituted by Russia in March, but was rigorously applied only after the Western powers had introduced their Western German currency into Berlin on June 18.

### Case for the U.N.?

The inability of the West to reach a satisfactory agreement with Russia concerning Germany as a whole, or Berlin

*Contents of this BULLETIN may be reproduced with credit to the Foreign Policy Association*

in particular, is not expected to create a war-like mood in Washington as long as France, the strongest continental friend of the United States, not only refuses to follow a policy hostile to Russia but is unable to agree on a stable government. The UN General Assembly, however, may give the United States and its Western associates a chance to settle the prob-

lem of Berlin, although a UN inquiry might not necessarily result in one-hundred per cent approval of the policy of the Western powers. A UN commission might come to the conclusion that the West is in part responsible for the Berlin disorders insofar as the establishment of a Western German state may have provoked Moscow to impose the blockade.

Yet it might also decide that Russia's policy in Eastern Germany had caused the Western powers to unite their zones into a new state. A UN inquiry would prove genuinely useful if it could provide the world with an objective review of the events that have led up to the present bitter controversy over Berlin.

BLAIR BOLLES

## ***Libya Poses Strategic Issues For Great Powers***

Agreement by the United States, Britain and France, to Russia's proposal for a meeting of the Big Four Council of Foreign Ministers in Paris beginning September 13 to discuss the future of the former Italian colonies in Africa brings to the fore a controversy on which difference of opinion between the Western powers complicates the usual East-West split.

The treaty of peace with Italy, which entered into force on September 15, 1947, gave the four great powers one year in which to reach agreement. Failing agreement, the controversy was to be submitted to the General Assembly of the UN for a recommendation which the Big Four pledged themselves in advance to accept.

The deputies of the Council of Foreign Ministers, having met intermittently during the past year, and having heard the report of a commission sent to make on-the-spot investigations in the colonies, found it impossible to arrive at an agreement except on relatively minor points: Ethiopia was to be granted a corridor to the sea through Eritrea; and Italian Somaliland was to be placed under Italian trusteeship. The final report of the deputies, signed on September 1, apparently did little more than set forth the views of each of the countries represented.

### ***National Points of View***

Chief interest in the controversy centers on Libya, whose position across the Mediterranean from the Italian boot gives it considerable strategic importance. This consideration of Mediterranean strategy underlies the attitude taken by each of the four powers.

Thus the Soviet Union, which in 1945 had sought a trusteeship over the colony, changed its position at the time of the Italian elections last February and declared it would favor return of the area to Italian control. This decision was probably motivated by a desire not only to help win

electoral support for the Italian Communists, but also to effect the departure of the British who, under the provisions of the peace, retain control pending final settlement. Moreover, it would be to Russia's interest to have the colonies in the hands of a relatively weak nation, particularly if there was a chance that this nation might some day go Communist.

France, like Russia, favors return of Libya to Italy, but it would like to keep possession of the Fezzan, the colony's southern desert, which would improve the military and commercial position of its North African colonies. It opposes immediate independence for Libya, since this might mean the establishment of a strong center for nationalist agitation which would adversely affect France's position in Tunisia and Algeria.

The most rigorous opposition to the return of Libya to Italy comes from Britain which, during the war, in return for Arab military aid against Germany, had promised the Senussi tribesmen of Cyrenaica in Northeast Libya that they would not be subjected again to Italian rule. Although Britain doubtless wishes to reduce the drain on its treasury necessitated by its present position in Libya, it would like to retain the military benefits of an occupation which strengthens its Middle East defense system. London is reported to be advocating division of Libya into three provinces: Cyrenaica, to become independent after a period of British trusteeship; the Fezzan, probably to go to France; and Tripolitania.

### ***U.S. Dilemma***

The opportunity of making political capital out of the issue of Italian colonies during the Presidential election campaign complicates the task of formulating United States policy, which appears to be characterized primarily by willingness to accept whatever solution meets the approval of the Western powers. Forewarnings of a par-

tisan struggle came when Governor Thomas Dewey on August 17, speaking to a group of Italian-American leaders, said, somewhat ambiguously, that Italy should participate in the development of the colonies, "preferably under the flexible provisions of a United Nations trusteeship." Subsequently President Truman commented, according to press reports, that such questions could not be "handled politically" in the United States. The President faces a dilemma between American commitments to support Britain on Cyrenaica, and fear of losing Italian-American votes and weakening pro-American feeling in Italy, should the United States oppose the Russian-sponsored Italian trusteeship.

On September 8, however, Secretary of State Marshall when asked in a press conference whether bipartisan agreement had been reached on the Italian colonies, said yes, he thought so. Speculation then arose that he might be referring to the American proposal of September 1945 at the Council of Foreign Ministers in London, which was understood to have been drafted in large part by John Foster Dulles, now foreign affairs adviser to Governor Dewey. This proposal called for UN trusteeship under a single administrator with an international advisory committee made up of representatives of the interested powers, including Italy. It will probably be a primary American objective to prevent the colony from falling under Soviet control and, at the same time, to guarantee that the area will be in the hands of an authority friendly to the Western powers. The maintenance of an American base at Mellaha, Tripolitania, underlines the importance of this objective. Meanwhile, all three Western powers would like to postpone the final settlement for a period of one year.

As might be expected, the Italian government would like very much to regain Libya. Relatively little popular enthusi-

asm, however, exists in Italy concerning this proposal, particularly as the desert colony always proved a costly possession.

Nevertheless Libya's return is desired by Italy to raise the country's prestige. Moreover, population pressure is strong in Italy

and it is claimed that the possibilities of colonization might offer some relief for this acute problem. FRED W. RIGGS

## ***U. N. General Assembly Tackles Varied Agenda***

When the United Nations General Assembly gathers in Paris on September 21 at the Palais de Chaillot, in the shadow of the Eiffel Tower, it will be confronted by a wide range of problems reflecting the world's perils and predicaments. The very fact, however, that the UN has so far survived three turbulent years of postwar conflicts between the wartime Allies is regarded by international seers as a favorable omen for the future. Among the many topics already listed on the Assembly's agenda, or expected to be placed on it during the session, are such controversial items as modification of the veto; provision of an armed guard for the UN; the next step to be taken with respect to the work of the Atomic Energy Commission; and an array of questions affecting international security, notably Palestine, Korea, Kashmir and Greece.

### ***Will Veto Be Modified?***

The Interim Committee of the UN General Assembly, better known as the Little Assembly—appointed a year ago at the suggestion of the United States but against the objections of the U.S.S.R. which, together with its Eastern European satellites, boycotted the Committee—is to report its findings to the Assembly. In spite of continued demands by smaller countries, notably Argentina, Australia and the Philippines, for outright abolition of the veto power granted by the UN Charter to the five great powers in the Security Council, the Interim Committee is not expected to recommend abandonment of the veto, which at San Francisco was urged by both the United States and the U.S.S.R. Instead, the Committee will propose two reforms: clarification and interpretation of what is meant by "procedural" questions, on which, under Article 27 of the Charter, decisions can be taken by a simple affirmative vote of seven members, as distinguished from "substantive" questions, on which the unanimity rule becomes operative; and the surrender, by agreement, of the veto on admission of new members to the UN.

The United States, it should be noted, has objected not to the veto power as such, but to what it considers overuse of the veto by the U.S.S.R. The Russian

### **United Nations Week**

The United Nations organization, established at San Francisco in 1945, is marking its third anniversary this year, and October 24 has been designated by the UN General Assembly as "United Nations Day." In preparation for this day honoring the work accomplished by the UN in spite of innumerable obstacles, the President of the United States has proclaimed the week of October 17 to 24 as United Nations Week. Since individuals and groups will be urged to take this occasion to acquaint themselves more thoroughly with the objectives and achievements of the UN, the Foreign Policy Association, in lieu of *FPA News*, is offering this week a background article outlining the main topics which are expected to be discussed by the General Assembly when it convenes in Paris on September 21. Other articles summarizing the activities of the Assembly will be published during the Paris session.

delegate in the Security Council has used the veto on twenty-seven separate occasions. An analysis of these vetoes shows that Russia invoked the veto with respect to seven main issues: admission of new members (12); withdrawal of British and French troops from Syria and the Lebanon (1); questions concerning Franco Spain (4); the mining of the Corfu Channel, attributed to Albania (1); creation of a committee to hear witnesses on the February 1948 Communist coup in Czechoslovakia (2); against acceptance of the report of the Atomic Energy Commission on June 22, 1948 (1); and questions concerning Greece, in which Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia were accused of aiding Greek guerrillas (6).

### ***Armed Guard for UN***

The UN Charter provides that each member of the organization, through a special agreement, will place at the disposal of the UN a specified contingent

of armed forces; and, in addition, will furnish the UN with an air force contingent for use in an emergency. The Military Staff Committee of the UN, composed of the representatives of the United States, Britain, Russia, France and China, was charged with the task of setting up a military force for the UN but, after three years of effort, has found itself deadlocked on the type and amount of armed forces to be supplied by the great powers, which must carry the main burden of arming the UN.

In view of this deadlock, which has left the UN without any means of enforcing its decisions, or even of protecting its representatives in danger zones, Secretary-General Trygve Lie, on June 10, in an address to the Harvard Alumni Association, proposed the establishment of a small guard force, as distinct from the striking force envisaged in the Charter. This force, as outlined by Mr. Lie, would be recruited by the Secretary-General, presumably on an international basis; would be armed with small arms only; and would be placed at the disposal of the Security Council for use in situations where the Council is called upon to assure peace and security. The availability of such a force, in the opinion of Mr. Lie, would greatly strengthen the effectiveness of the UN in disturbed areas to which UN mediators or fact-finding commissions are dispatched, notably Palestine, Korea, Kashmir, Greece and Indonesia, and would be of material assistance in the enforcement of truces and the holding of plebiscites. While Mr. Lie envisaged a force of between one and two thousand men, subsequent suggestions have raised the number to five thousand. A similar proposal was made on September 6 by the American Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, a private organization headed by experts on world affairs. On September 8 Warren R. Austin, permanent United States delegate to the UN, in a broadcast on the General Assembly, officially gave the support of the United States to Mr. Lie's proposal. It is believed that this proposal, not yet on the Assembly's agenda, may be included during the session.



## Atomic Energy Commission

The Atomic Energy Commission of the UN, after making an exhaustive study of the various problems of international control of nuclear fuel and its use for destructive as well as constructive purposes, came to the conclusion in June 1948 that no effective alternative has been found to the plan it had worked out. This plan, submitted to the Security Council, was approved on June 22 by 9 of the 11 members of the Council, with the U.S.S.R. and the Ukraine voting in the negative. Under the circumstances, the Commission, in its own words, "has been forced to recognize that agreement on effective measures for the control of atomic energy is itself dependent on cooperation in broader fields of policy," and has concluded that no useful purpose "can be served by carrying on negotiations at the Commission level." The Commission, therefore, in accordance with its terms of reference, has submitted its three reports and its recommendations to the Security Council, and has recommended that they be transmitted to the General Assembly "as a matter of special concern." The Assembly has a choice of either repudiating the work of the Commission, or of approving its plan and informing Russia that further negotiations at present are useless because of Moscow's refusal to accept the plan which, it is acknowledged by all, cannot be effective until it has been accepted by all nations.

## Political Problems

The political problems which are expected to come, in one form or another, before the General Assembly, include most of the areas where either East and West are directly in conflict, or where East-West friction aggravates local controversies. Among them are *Palestine* (the provisional government of the State of Israel, recognized *de facto* or *de jure* by a number of UN members, is expected to ask for admission to the UN, with Britain already on the record as opposed to this move); *Korea* (the Assembly may be asked to discuss the question of withdrawal of United States and Russian troops, as well as to decide on continuation of the United Nations Commission

which supervised elections in Southern Korea); *Greece* (the Greek government has made fresh accusations against Yugoslavia, charged with aiding Greek guerrillas); *Kashmir* (the United Nations Commission sent to arrange for a plebiscite reported early in September that its cease-fire order could not be put into effect because of differences between India and Pakistan, at odds over this strategic area); *Indonesia* (progress toward stabilization of relations between the government of the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia under the auspices of a UN Committee of Good Offices has been slow, and each side has accused the other of truce violations); and *Franco Spain* (some of the Latin American countries are expected to ask the General Assembly to rescind the greatly watered-down resolution of 1947 criticizing Franco's regime).

New political questions, moreover, may be placed on the Assembly's agenda after the start of the session. Among these are the appeal to the Security Council of the princely state of Hyderabad against "invasion" by India; disposal of Italy's colonies in Africa; and the four-power conflict over Berlin, so far unresolved by direct negotiations. The possibility that Korea, the Italian colonies, and the four-power administration of Berlin may come up for discussion in the Assembly indicates the extent to which the UN, which originally was not supposed to deal with the problems of peace-making, has become a forum for discussion of all conflicts that disturb, or threaten to disturb, world peace.

VERA MICHELES DEAN

## New Headline Series Editor

Thomas K. Ford, editor of the *Headline Series* for two years, has joined the editorial staff of the *Washington Post*. His successor is William W. Wade, who received his B.A. at the University of Minnesota in 1939, and in 1948 completed work for an M.Sc. (Economics) at the London School of Economics and Political Science. From 1939 to 1945 Mr. Wade worked for International News Service, first in New York and Chicago, then overseas in Iceland, Britain and France.

## News in the Making

Reports from London on September 9 indicate that consultations by military experts on detailed blueprints for *pooling of the resources of the United States, Canada and states of Western Europe* in the event of war are at an advanced stage. These consultations are not expected to lead to a formal military alliance, but to provide a basis for common action in an emergency. Public announcement of military aid plans is not expected until after the American elections in November. . . . Concrete steps for gradual implementation of a *Franco-Italian customs union*, already agreed upon in principle, are now under consideration by a mixed committee of experts from the two countries. Count Carlo Sforza, Italian Foreign Minister, in announcing the inauguration of this committee's work on September 9 stressed that the European nations, by adopting measures of self-help, could demonstrate to the United States their determination to do their share under the ERP. . . . *The British Trades Union Congress*, representing nearly 8,000,000 workers, at its annual convention at Margate September 7 to 10 endorsed the Labor government's economic stabilization program urged by Sir Stafford Cripps, and inflicted a resounding defeat on Communists in the labor movement. Of the twelve candidates proposed by the Communists for the forty-two places on the governing bodies and committees of the TUC, only one man was elected, and that was a case where the incumbent was finishing out an unexpired term. . . . The TUC also defeated a resolution supporting the *World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU)* which, said Arthur Deakin, British trade union leader and WFTU president, has been "captured" by the Communists who are now busy fomenting unrest in Malaya and other parts of Asia and Africa. . . . After almost two months of consultation the United States and the Marshall plan countries in Europe are concluding their negotiations for loan agreements. Eighty per cent of ERP funds are to be dispersed as grants, and the remainder as credits.

FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN. Vol. XXVII, No. 43, SEPTEMBER 17, 1948. Published weekly from September through May inclusive and biweekly during June, July and August by the Foreign Policy Association, Incorporated. National Headquarters, 22 East 38th Street, New York 16, N. Y. BROOKS EMERY, President; HELEN M. DAGGETT, Secretary; VERA MICHELES DEAN, Editor. Re-entered as second-class matter June 4, 1948, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Four Dollars a Year. Please allow at least one month for change of address on membership publications.

F. P. A. Membership (which includes the Bulletin), Six Dollars a Year.

Produced under union conditions and composed and printed by union labor.